Towards Product Centric Manufacturing

Published in:
17th International Conference on Industrial Informatics, INDIN 2019

DOI:
10.1109/INDIN41052.2019.8972137

Published: 01/01/2019

Please cite the original version:
Towards Product Centric Manufacturing: From Digital Twins to Product Assembly

Vladimir Kuliaev, Udayanto Dwi Atmojo, Seppo Sierla, Jan Olaf Blech, Valeriy Vyatkin

Department of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Aalto University
Helsinki, Finland

Email: {vladimir.kuliaev, udayanto.atmojo, seppo.sierla, jan.blech, valeriy.vyatkin}@aalto.fi

Abstract—In product-centric manufacturing paradigm, a digital counterpart of a product will request manufacturing services to assemble itself. A modelling & assembly planning framework for product-centric design is considered and extended in this paper. Furthermore, we present a case-study on a product-centric digital twin controlling the assembly of its physical counterpart using a collaborative robot.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Industry 4.0, the fourth industrial revolution, is expected to bring about the dissolution of the well-established automation architecture [1-4]. It is based on the emerging Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0), which promises real time availability of data and information over lifecycle phases and organizational boundaries [5]. Globally, RAMI 4.0 is considered a major reference architecture which competes with the US-driven Industrial Internet Consortium’s IIAR (Industrial Internet Reference Architecture). Currently, mature technology in RAMI 4.0 is the OPC UA [6,7]. The counterpart of OPC UA in IIAR is DDS (Data Distribution Service) [8], which has been used in several cyber-physical production systems applications [9-11]. However, the body of research in RAMI 4.0 is more extensive than the literature on IIAR in the scientific field in general, and in the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society publication forums in particular, so in this paper, the terminology for previous research in RAMI 4.0 is used. In the context of RAMI 4.0, the focus so far has been on enabling technology, but the true revolution will occur when the technology is effectively exploited for the servitization of industry with advanced agile manufacturing paradigms executed by networked enterprises [3,12-14]. The need for agile manufacturing arises not only from rapidly changing market demand but also from novel product design approaches exploring larger parts of the design space [15] and the need to perform concurrent product design and assembly planning [16].

One example of an agile manufacturing-typed paradigm is the product-centric manufacturing. The revolutionary idea behind the product-centric manufacturing is that the digital counterpart of a product will request manufacturing services [17-23]. The benefit of product-centric manufacturing is that the manufacturing facility no longer requires offline assumptions about the types of products being manufactured, the kinds of operations required to manufacture each product order, and their order of executions. A stark contrast with the traditional practice, this results in potentially radical improvements in the capability to react to orders for increasingly personalized (customized) products in an agile fashion. However, the said publications focus on supply chain management and factory logistics.

Recent work has extended the product-centric manufacturing paradigm to the factory floor domain [24], demonstrating the concept in a self-made virtualized 3D environment. The extension of product-centric control to the factory floor level is accomplished by utilizing the emerging concept of the digital twin [25-27] of the product and the production resources. The digital twin is augmented with the capability for performing product-centric manufacturing. The work in [24] is then extended to utilize OPC UA (Open Platform Communications Unified Architecture) to communicate the digital product description from the designer to one or more potential manufacturers [28], so that the designer and manufacturer may be of different organizations. However, this attempt so far goes only as far as virtual world (simulation). It lacks a comprehensive solution which covers the full lifecycle from digital product descriptions to “real”, physical assembly.

This paper presents a new development that enables an integrated approach for product-centric manufacturing. The paper proposes a comprehensive solution which allows product-centric manufacturing in the factory floor and covers more comprehensive lifecycle from digital product descriptions to physical assembly. This paper is organized as follows. Section II provides some background information related to the product-centric manufacturing concept considered in the paper and the assembly planning and modeling framework. Section III describes presents an extension of the framework to integrate physical assembly. Section IV presents case studies which demonstrate the capabilities of the proposed framework, and Section V concludes the paper and points out some potential
future works. In particular, the paper presents the following contributions:

- A full, extended framework developed on top of the one described in [24] with connection to physical assembly station on the factory floor.
- The implemented connection to a physical assembly of ABB IRB 14000 YuMi collaborative robot.
- Experimental results on using the framework to assemble lego-brick models in a product centric way.

II. BACKGROUND

This section presents our overall concept and the existing planning and modeling framework which is used as a basis for our product centric manufacturing.

A. Concept

The product-centric manufacturing concept considered in this paper has 3 stages as illustrated in Figure 1:

1. Firstly, the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) designer sends a digital product description to one or more manufacturers, who will automatically and promptly perform a virtual assembly in a virtualized 3D production cell without any need for manual and physical engineering work. This has been achieved in a previous work for lego-block designs using collision detection (see [24] supplementary video 2) and for generic CAD part designs without collision detection (see [24] supplementary video 1). Based on the results of the virtual assembly, such as the above-mentioned video captures, the designer can assess, e.g., whether the design is practical and economical from the assembly perspective and if the manufacturer has suitable capabilities for manufacturing this design. The feedback can be used to modify the design and to narrow down the set of potential manufacturers. This stage can be rapidly repeated as often as needed.

2. In the second stage, the assembly is piloted with physical product parts and production equipment (“Pilot assembly”). For example, pilot assembly may involve Additive Manufacturing (AM), which is a potential technology for reducing the delays involved at this stage [29] especially due to overcoming the delays from the supply chain [30]. Although AM may not yet be a cost-effective technology for mass production [31-32], it is well suited for this stage in which pilots are needed to verify the results of the virtual assembly with a physical setup. In this case, all of the product parts might be 3D printed from their CAD files linked to the digital product description.

3. The third stage (“Ramp up”) involves ramping up the production with the chosen manufacturer, after the design has been adjusted based on the results of the first two stages. The parts may continue to be produced with AM, a hybrid scenario which combines AM and conventional supply chain management [33], or even completely without AM.

In summary, the proposed concept could result in disruptive changes to how the manufacturing sector works, allowing innovative designers with small budgets to emerge, without needing to invest in dedicated production facilities. This can be made possible through the emergence of the versatile manufacturing facilities which can adhere to the concept as illustrated in Figure 1. However, only stage 1 of Figure 1 has been implemented in the previous research, consisting of a purely virtualized environment with considerable simplifying assumptions on the Cartesian robots that were used. A key challenge to be solved towards realizing stages 2 and 3 will be to adapt the methodology to include physical assembly, e.g., using physical robots with versatile capabilities.

B. Assembly Planning and Modeling Framework

This paper considers the assembly planning and modeling framework proposed in [24], which is claimed to enable plugging in more sophisticated ASP (Assembly Sequence Planning) and APP (Assembly Path Planning) algorithms to meet the specific needs of manufacturing cells, robots and products. So far, this framework has only been demonstrated in a self-made virtualized 3D environment with highly simplified Cartesian robots.

This paper considers the automatic assembly of products based on their digital product descriptions. In [28], products were created from workpieces/materials in the form of lego blocks and OPC UA address spaces were used for the product descriptions. A screenshot of an example product description of a “lego tower” on an OPC UA server is shown in Fig. 2. OPC UA types for square and rectangle legos have been defined with the appropriate connection points. legos are under a Parts folder. The screenshot from UaExpert shows one example design with several square and rectangle legos. In the Address space pane, the ‘Color’ attribute of the ‘rect1’ lego has been selected. In the Attributes pane, it can be seen that the value of this attribute is green.
Based on the information in the product description, the methodology presented in [24] will automatically construct a digital twin of the final assembled product, using the 3D properties of the square and rectangle lego types as well as the connections between the legos in the product description. The digital twin is augmented with a product-centric control capability, including ASP and APP. The work demonstrated a product-centric control using a virtual cartesian robot in a 3D virtual environment. In this environment, interconnected nodes are manipulated and the limitations, constraints and challenges of the physical world are ignored.

The following UML2 sequence diagram in Fig.3 presents the product-centric control for the stages 2 and 3 of Fig.1. This algorithm is executed cyclically, so each execution will exercise only a part of the code, according to the guard conditions in the opt, break and alt fragments. The function nextUnassembledPart() towards the bottom of the sequence is responsible for ASP. planAssemblyPath() is responsible for APP, returning a Trajectory object consisting of waypoints and rotations of the part to be assembled. The various Boolean variables are used to control the translational movement to the next waypoint or the rotation.

When the translation or rotation has accomplished, the sequence proceeds to call the nextPoint() method of the Trajectory object. If this returns null, the sequence will go to the place() method and proceed to the next call of ASP. In this paper, this sequence has been implemented on a PC machine that hosts the digital twin and communicates with a physical assembly station (ABB IRB14000 YuMi robot) through socket in order to realize the product-centric manufacturing in the physical world.

III. PRODUCT CENTRIC CONTROL IN A PHYSICAL ASSEMBLY CELL

In this section, the product-centric control is implemented and interfaced to resources in the physical assembly cell. The overall architecture of the proposed solution is shown in Fig.4.
A. Assembly Planning/Modelling Framework Side

The framework described in Section 2 is implemented in Java and may run on various computing platforms, e.g., PC. Based on the given digital product descriptions, the framework automatically generates several information regarding the workpiece. This includes the type of the workpiece, the name/identification of the workpiece, the three axis coordinates of where the workpiece should be placed (the target location) through the mechanism described in Section 2, and whether it requires the workpiece to be rotated for 90 degrees. This information needs to be transferred to the physical assembly station.

To achieve the aforementioned goal, some improvements had to be made to the framework described in the previous section, in particular:
  - Introduce communication interface: The information generated by the planning/modelling framework needs to be transmitted to physical station controller on the factory floor, so this communication interface needs to be introduced. At this stage, this communication interface is realized through TCP/IP communication socket which is available in many execution/controller platforms, including in Java environment (which the planning/modelling framework is implemented in currently). In the next development stage, this could easily be replaced with standardized communication protocol in automation, e.g., OPC UA in a client-server model.
  - A messaging protocol is introduced between the framework and the physical station controllers. This includes the message to start, message which contains the information generated by the planning/modelling framework, and finish the robot program execution. The information from the planning/modelling framework is appended together as one message to simplify the protocol.
  - Actuator coordination (in our particular case, e.g. the rotation of workpiece) functionality in the DigitalTwin class underwent changes to make the message structure more compact.

B. Physical Assembly Side

In general, physical assembly stations can have different hardware controllers (e.g., PLCs of different vendors) with different software environments and actuators. Our physical setup is illustrated in Fig. 4 inside the red-dashed area. In this setup, the physical assembly actor corresponds to one ABB IRB 14000 Dual Arm Precision “YuMI” robot. The YuMI robot is based on IRC5 controller and relies on RAPID programming language environment. Thus in this case, the robot control software logic is implemented using RAPID language. To implement the robot control software logic in this scenario, the following components/functionalities have been realized:

1. Calibration. In our scenario, this involves the calibration of the YuMI’s gripping fingers’ arm, which is necessary for the robot software control logic. This calibration is done to obtain the absolute position of the YuMI’s gripper when it is opening and closing.
2. Initialization. This function which is responsible for opening the network communication socket and waiting for the message containing a “Start” message. Upon receiving the Start message, the control logic actuates both YuMI’s arm to move them to a “safe” position according to the YuMI technical documentations. The safe position is required as collision avoidance is turned off for pushing the blocks together.
3. The following describes the entire software control logic for assembling the product out of workpieces. The program is presented as a recurring loop, which consists of the following:
   - Execute the “Initialization” function. This function actuates YuMI’s arms to the initial (safe) position, if they are not in such position yet.
   - Communication to transmit and receive message. This communication is achieved through socket. Unfortunately, the RAPID programming language supports less data types compared to Java, however the language supports string and byte formats which are also available in Java. Here, the string format is chosen since it can be used to transmit information of different “nature” from simple numbers to words. Byte format was also an option, however the byte format of the message is more difficult to make sense for development
Separation of the message to extract different information included in the message, which includes type of the workpiece, ID of the workpiece, whether the workpiece needs to be rotated for assembly, and the three axis coordinates of the workpiece at the final location of assembly.

Actuate the YuMI arm to approach the correct workpiece, actuate the gripper to grab and pick the correct workpiece using its gripper, and then move the arm towards the target location as determined by the three axis coordinates via safe trajectories, and then place the workpiece on the target location.

Pushing the workpiece on the assembly position. In this case study, the pushing is necessary since the case study involves workpiece in the form of lego blocks. This pushing will ensure that the workpiece is attached firmly to the assembly position. This pushing action is performed by gentle pressing on the workpiece. The pushing action is performed twice to ensure that the workpiece has been attached properly.

Robot arms returns to the initial (“safe”) position before it can receive the next command to pick and assemble the next workpiece.

4. Completion: The control logic checks if the “Stop” message was received. When this message is received, the robot moves both arms to the safe position. When the arms have reached the safe position, will then robot can be transported to some other location if needed.

The robot software control logic can be presented as a flowchart shown in Fig. 5.

IV. CASE STUDIES

To demonstrate the capability and the agility of the proposed solution in assembling customized products, two case studies of assembly planning & execution are considered.

The digital product descriptions in OPC UA are not intended for the human reader, so in this section they are represented in a different format as follows. The relevant information has been extracted from the digital product descriptions and then presented in two tables. The first table includes the information typically present in a BOM (Bill of Materials) as well as the angle of orientation of the part/workpiece during assembly. The second table presents the connections between the workpieces (“connection configuration”). It’s important to note that the case studies consider lego blocks as workpieces. A rectangle lego has three “connection” points in our case studies, to which another lego block can be connected to.

Every connection points represents the center of the 4x2 studs of the lego block, and in the case of 4x2 studs lego block, each connection point has interleaving 2x1 studs with the adjacent connection point. The three connection points on the top surface are referred as topA, topB, topC. Meanwhile on the bottom, lego block has connections points bottomA, bottomB and bottomC. The information provided in both tables is sufficient to determine the coordinates of where each workpieces/lego blocks will be moved to during assembly, and the information is used to generate ASP and APP by the assembly planning and modelling framework.
For the purpose of description, the case studies will be referred as “Square Tower” and “Pyramid Tower”.

A. Case Study 1 “Square Tower”

The Square Tower is assembled from 10 lego blocks and has a square shape with the same number of lego blocks on each stack. The product descriptions of the Square tower are presented in Table 1 (it’s “BOM” and angle of orientation) and Table 2 (it’s “connection configuration”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Part id</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan1</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan2</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan3</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan4</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan5</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan6</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan7</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan8</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan9</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan10</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parts used to assemble Square Tower has the same type (RectangleLego), with various colors and orientations. How these parts are connected is described in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 First tower connection list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The planning/modelling framework generates new information which is then sent to the YuMI robot for the assembly of Square Tower. Some snapshots of the physical assembly of the Square Tower and its digital counterpart is shown in Fig. 6.

B. Case Study 2 “Pyramid Tower”

This Pyramid Tower case study is similar to the Square Tower, in a sense that it uses the same number of lego blocks (10 lego blocks). However, the main difference is that the Pyramid Tower has a pointed tip (i.e., only has one lego block at the top most stack), which is not the case for Square Tower, and the bottom stack of the Pyramid Tower uses more lego blocks than the Square Tower. The product descriptions of the Pyramid Tower are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Part id</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan1</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan5</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan2</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan3</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan4</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan6</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan7</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan8</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RectangleLego</td>
<td>Rectan9</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SquareLego</td>
<td>Square1</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the product description, the planning/modelling framework generates the information to be sent to the YuMI robot. Some snapshots of physical assembly and its digital counterpart are shown in Fig. 7. As an additional note, the top most stack of the Pyramid Tower uses 2x2 studs lego block (referred as SquareLego) instead of 4x2 studs lego block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Pyramid tower connection list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectan9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 6: Physical and digital counterpart of Square Tower](image)

![Figure 7: Physical and digital counterpart of Pyramid Tower](image)
V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposed a framework for product-centric design so that it connects to manufacturing devices. Here, a digital counterpart of a product requests manufacturing services to assemble itself. In a concrete realization, a digital twin controls the assembly of its physical counterpart by communicating with ABB’s YuMi collaborative robot.

Future work will feature more generalized production steps such as transportation of workpieces between production islands and the control of these production islands through digital twins. Furthermore, there is an interest particularly to connect digital twins to visualization platforms [34]. Formal modeling and reasoning about digital twins, e.g., for safety and collision avoidance similar to the work in [35] is also a topic for the future. More accurate 3D models of the manufacturing equipment is a goal for the very near future, this should also allow for a more precise collision avoidance. The aspect of dynamicity is also worth investigating, e.g., similar to the work in [36] [37].
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